TERRORISM: THE TURKISH EXPERIENCE

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITY AND TERRORISM

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

TURKISH EXPERIENCE WITH TERRORISM

JUNE 25, 1981

Serial No. J–97–43

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
85-813 O WASHINGTON : 1981

5521-25

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

STROM THURMOND, South Carolina, *Chairman*

CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., Maryland	JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., Delaware
PAUL LAXALT, Nevada	EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah	ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia
ROBERT DOLE, Kansas	HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
ALAN K. SIMPSON, Wyoming	DENNIS DECONCINI, Arizona
JOHN P. EAST, North Carolina	PATRICK J. LEAHY, Vermont
CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Iowa	MAX BAUCUS, Montana
JEREMIAH DENTON, Alabama	HOWELL HEFLIN, Alabama
ARLEN SPECTER, Pennsylvania	

VINTON DEVANE LIDE, *Chief Counsel*
QUENTIN CROMMELIN, JR., *Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITY AND TERRORISM

JEREMIAH DENTON, Alabama, *Chairman*

ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah	JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., Delaware
JOHN P. EAST, North Carolina	PATRICK J. LEAHY, Vermont

JOEL S. LISKER, *Chief Counsel and Staff Director*

CONTENTS

PREPARED STATEMENT

	Page
Chairman Jeremiah Denton	1

WITNESSES

Yalcin, Aydin, professor of economics in the faculty of political sciences, University of Ankara, and Osman Okyar, professor of economics, University of Hacettepe	4
Prepared statement	27

TERRORISM: THE TURKISH EXPERIENCE

THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 1981

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITY AND TERRORISM,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:50 a.m., in room 2228, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Jeremiah Denton (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Also present: Senators East and Thurmond [ex officio].

Staff present: Joel S. Lisker, chief counsel and staff director; Bert W. Milling, Jr., counsel; and Fran Wermuth, chief clerk.

STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN JEREMIAH DENTON

Senator DENTON. Good morning. This hearing will come to order.

We welcome you here this morning. A special welcome to my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, Senator John East, whose interest in this subject is manifested by a recent article in Human Events on June 13, entitled: "Is the USSR Really Supporting International Terrorism?"

Senator East is here in spite of pressing commitments elsewhere. As I understand it, Senator East, you will have to leave us reasonably soon?

Senator EAST. In about an hour.

Senator DENTON. Thank you very much for your attendance this morning.

I would like to welcome our two witnesses who have come all the way from Turkey to testify this morning.

Prof. Aydin Yalcin is professor of economics in the faculty of political sciences, University of Ankara, and Prof. Osman Okyar is professor of economics, University of Hacettepe.

Welcome, gentlemen.

I have an opening statement. I have asked Senator East, and he says that he will defer on that point.

After making my statement, I will ask the witnesses to come forward and make their own opening statement.

This Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism has held four hearings apart from oversight hearings. Previous hearings have examined international terrorism in a broad fashion so as to help the subcommittee understand the origins, directions, and interrelationships of various groups involved with terrorism.

We have also examined the sources of support, both direct and indirect, for terrorist activity worldwide.

Special attention has been focused on the Soviet Union and its surrogates, in light of their apparent major commitment to inter-

national terrorism as a tool for destabilizing Western governments in an effort to further their ultimate goal of world Communism.

I believe this morning's hearing will be particularly contributory toward that portion of our investigation.

We have also studied the historical antecedents of Soviet terrorism to better understand their involvement with this insidious method for bringing about political change.

At our hearing on June 11, 1981, I made a statement regarding terrorist elements and Marxist influences in the Provisional IRA.

On the following day, June 12, the subcommittee witness, Dr. Stefan Possony, testified that "it is quite clear that there is a strong Marxist-Leninist element in the Provisional arm of the IRA."

Since my comments did not, in my view, fully reflect my understanding of this issue, I should like to state the following in an attempt to clarify my present understanding of this issue.

The official wing of the IRA is a Marxist organization which in the late 1960's rejected terrorism as a solution to the political and economic issues which divided families in Northern Ireland. The Provisional wing of the IRA was a splinter group formed in the late 1960's by a faction of the membership which advocated indiscriminate use of terror as a major tactic to accomplish its political and social goals for an Ireland united under Socialist principles.

The main intent of my comment was to point out that this distinction is not understood by many well-meaning Irish-Americans and others who funnel their hard-earned money to support what they believe to be a legitimate, purely nationalist organization which uses violence reluctantly as a last resort to achieve what cannot be achieved by peaceful means.

During the last 10 years, there have been hundreds of terrorist attacks undertaken by the IRA which resulted in heaping misery on totally unsuspecting and largely innocent victims. This clearly demonstrates the Provisional IRA's total commitment to the most brutal terrorist tactics.

My last point on this issue is this. The main mouthpiece of the Provisional Sinn Fein, which is the legal political arm of the illegal Provisional IRA, is a publication called An Phoblacht, meaning Republican News, which publication adopts an undisguised "left wing/revolutionary tone."

Successive governments of the Irish Republic have been described by An Phoblacht as "fascist" and "neocolonial." The Provisional Sinn Fein speakers have been urged to tell the unemployed "to take to the streets and terrify the ruling class into giving them work."

That is urged by that publication.

The current war, as the publication refers to it, is described as "a people's war against imperialism" and "a war of liberation" designed to set up a system of control "returning full power to the people."

I heard those terms hundreds of times when I was in a Communist nation and regard it as the all too familiar rhetoric of Marxist-Leninism. I am sure that those in this audience identify it the same way.

Ruairi O'Bradaigh, IRA man of 30 years and president of the Provisional Sinn Fein, was quoted in L'Europeo, September 13, 1979, as saying:

> We do not want a confederation of the south with the north; nor do we want an independent Ulster. We want a general dismantling of the existing establishment in the Irish Republic and Ulster both.

He went on to explain his views on dismantling both the Irish Republic and Ulster in the publication Il Giornale Nuovo, published in Milan on September 2, 1979.

In my comments, I have not addressed and certainly do not intend to minimize the pervasive economic and social discriminations imposed upon the Catholics of Northern Ireland which have given rise to this violence from the point of view of those looking at it and perhaps misunderstanding its nature.

Nor do I wish to ignore the extraordinary legal procedures employed by the British Government in Northern Ireland.

Those procedures include routine detention for up to 7 days without preferring charges; coercive interrogations sanctioned by law; de facto internment in the form of remands, awaiting trial; and, in some cases, trial without jury pursuant to provisions weighted heavily against the accused, including the placing of the burden of proof on the defendant.

I am sure that the British would say that they are forced into such activities by terrorism.

As chairman of this subcommittee, I am giving full consideration to scheduling a hearing after the summer recess to address the problem of terrorism in Northern Ireland and the roots and infrastructure of U.S. private support for the terrorists.

In recent weeks, the world was shocked by the attempted assassination of Pope John Paul II by a Turkish terrorist with reportedly right-wing ties. Thereafter, we learned of the hijacking of a Turkish airliner to Bulgaria by alleged left-wing Turkish terrorists.

More recently, the 18th Turkish diplomat to be assassinated was killed abroad by reportedly Armenian terrorists.

Moreover, within the last 3 years, Turkey has suffered over 25,000 casualties, killed and wounded, as a consequence of terrorism which has run rampant in that democratic country.

In order to give a proper appreciation for the magnitude of this slaughter, these numbers represent the equivalent of the entire population of Pottstown, Pa.

These alarming events have directed the Western world's attention to the plight of Turkey, a situation which in my view has received too little notice in the American press and media.

For more than 30 years, Turkey has been ruled by a democratic regime. The slogan or maxim "sovereignty belongs unconditionally to the nation" has served as the foundation of this democratic state.

Turkey is one of Islam's last free societies, the sole remaining Moslem state to have authentic elections and multiple parties.

You will hear from the witnesses of the remarkable progress, in terms of the rate of change toward democratic institutions and practices within the state.

Turkey is indispensable to her NATO allies for the defense of southern Europe and the eastern Mediterranean and, therefore, a

highly visible target for Soviet-engineered destabilization and take-over efforts.

Therefore, I believe it is most appropriate that we take a closer look at the Turkish experience with terrorism.

In my own belief, as far as the United States is concerned, I do not believe we have reached the ideal set down by our Founding Fathers. I do not mean to make a direct comparison between the state of democratic practices in the two countries.

This closer look at Turkish experience with terrorism will be furthered by our witnesses here today, two men who have not only studied this problem in a scholarly fashion but also have lived in its midst.

I will ask you gentlemen, if you will, to come forward and take your places.

Prof. Aydin Yalcin is a professor of economics in the Faculty of Political Science at the University of Ankara.

Prof. Osman Okyar is professor of economics at the University of Hacettepe in Ankara.

Professor Yalcin presently publishes a scientific biweekly called Forum and writes for various Turkish and foreign newspapers and periodicals.

From 1965 to 1973, he was a member of the Turkish Parliament and the National Executive Committee of the Justice Party. He has also authored various books on Communism in Turkey, Fascism, and contemporary doctrinaire movements.

Professor Okyar is the former rector of the University of Ataturk at Erzurum.

He has served in the Turkish Government in several senior posts and as head of the Economics Department and dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Hacettepe.

Again, welcome, gentlemen. We look forward to your testimony. We greatly appreciate your presence.

Would you care to make an opening statement?

STATEMENT OF AYDIN YALCIN, PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS IN THE FACULTY OF POLITICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF ANKARA, AND OSMAN OKYAR, PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITY OF HACETTEPE

Dr. YALCIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is a great pleasure and privilege for me to share my opinions and my thoughts with you on such a problem as international terrorism which affects the whole free world.

As you emphasized in your opening statement, I am going to talk as a person who was a kind of victim, as I tried to explain in my written statement. I had to carry a bodyguard for a long time.

Fortunately, I feel very free; and we are no more under threat.

To communicate to you our experiences and observations and our concern, not only for our own nation but also for the whole free world, I am going to start with a general observation.

THE REPEAT OF HISTORY

Turkey was under direct threat by Soviet Russia in 1946 when Mr. Molotov asked our Ambassador to cede some part of eastern Turkey to Soviet Russia and to install joint military defense instal-

lations on the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus, the straits linking the Black Sea and the Mediterranean.

We felt for the first time that we were under direct threat from Soviet Russia. We decided to resist. We had the sympathy and help of the United States under the Truman doctrine. That was very great moral support for us.

After so many years, we feel and we see that the cycle has moved all the way around. This time, the threat is not direct but indirect. The demand is not direct but by proxy.

The same territorial demands are repeated this time by the Soviet-supported terrorists and most splinter parties who profess to be Marxist-Leninist and allies of Soviet Russia.

I refer to Armenian terrorists, Asala, who said this openly. I also refer in my written statement to some Marxist-Kurdish cessationists who also professed quite openly that they have had Soviet support and they are grateful for it—to the whole Turkish nation on Turkish television.

As this committee is interested to know more about the complete evidence of this grand design, which I tried to describe, I should like to refer you to some of the points I tried to develop in my written statement.

I am not going to read it, but I would just like to summarize some of the points which show very clearly and very undeniably the Soviet and Eastern European involvement and some other surrogates of the Soviets, such as the Marxist factions of the PLO, such as George Habbash's guerrilla groups and also Syria's involvement in training and arming Turkish terrorists.

In my written statement, there is very impressive evidence of this foreign involvement in Turkish terrorism. I gave you some facts and figures about the cost of total armaments captured in Turkey after the 12th of September last year.

The total cost of this enormous armament, which goes up to nearly 650,000 small arms, is calculated by the Turkish authorities, as stated by the Turkish head of state, General Evren, in one of his public speeches, is estimated to cost about $250 million.

He said that the security authorities had added up the total amount of internal money obtained through bank robberies and extortions and it was not even one-fiftieth of this total. That means 2 percent of this enormous amount of financial cost.

He asked: Where does it come from? It certainly comes from secret sources and from illegal sources.

Senator DENTON. May I just make sure I heard you correctly there?

First, I would like to welcome the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator Strom Thurmond, who just came in.

Sir, would you care to make a comment?

Senator THURMOND. Please continue. I am in another committee, but I just came in for a little while.

Senator DENTON. All right.

Professor Yalcin I believe just said that the total number of small arms and various types of arms was something like 650,000. It was 633,724 for terrorism in his country. The calculations as to their cost amounted to $250 million.

In looking into the money that bank robberies and extortion by terrorists contributed toward that sum, they found it was roughly 2 percent of the cost of those armaments. Is that correct, sir?

Dr. YALCIN. That is correct.

Senator DENTON. Please proceed.

FOREIGN AID TO TERRORISTS

Dr. YALCIN. This is the just the armament part of this infrastructure.

People ask themselves how much it would cost to maintain the whole fighting group, which is armed by nearly 650,000 arms. These figures relate to the 1st of June. Every day new findings are discovered and confiscated from the terrorists.

For financing safe houses, travels, and other expenses, our security people calculate that the total finances required for such an amount of terrorist activity should be around at least three times this $250 million.

In other words, this a real war; this is not a fantasy of a few amateurs who profess themselves to be fighting for a religious cause. It is a professional thing; it is an army by itself.

I should like to continue with such circumstantial evidence which accumulates every day.

I should like to remind you that we are right at the beginning. We have just scratched the surface. We do not know yet, the full extent of the problem, because the investigations are still continuing. I am sure within a matter of 1 year or 2, Turkey will be able to contribute more because we shall be in a position to know much better through court proceedings and through documents captured by our security authorities.

This is evidence collected just at the beginning of this tremendous operation.

I should like to come to the sources of this armament. Soviet arms figure prominently in these findings. Kalashnikovs have become more or less a part of the household equipment in certain parts of Turkey.

There are two routes which this tremendous number of armaments penetrate into Turkey. It is along the Black Sea coast in the north which has very direct access to Bulgaria.

From time to time in Turkish press, small shipments of arms are captured with dubious destinations.

In 1977, a Greek vessel called *Vasoula* was stopped on the Bosphorous. It was carrying about 67 tons of armaments, allegedly destined for Ethiopia, contrary to the original information given to Istanbul Port authorities.

Another interesting incident occurred 3 years ago when some Argentine-made armaments were captured in the hands of Turkish terrorists. The serial numbers were on them.

The Foreign Ministry contacted the Argentinian Government about how it came to Turkey. They said it was manufactured on an order from a Bulgarian state agency and shipped about 3 weeks ago to Bulgaria.

You can form an idea about the efficiency and speed of how Argentinian-manufactured armaments ended up in the hands of Turkish terrorists.

FOREIGN ORIGINS OF ARMS

In total, security authorities estimate that about 60 percent of armaments captured from the terrorists have Western brands. They make a qualification, saying that most of these arms are fake or counterfeit manufactured.

They gave me just two examples to illustrate what they mean. The French-manufactured Unique pistols and guns were sent to France to the manufacturing firm. They said it was not their manufacturer at all, and the serial number did not tell if it was their manufacturer.

In a second case, certain Berettas—Italian-made guns—were captured from the Turkish terrorists. The foreign office got in touch with the Italian firm, and they were told that this same serial number was still in the hands of the Italian Carabinieri. It was, again, a fake manufacturer. It was manufactured under a Beretta license in Bulgaria.

Senator DENTON. May I make sure I understand you on this, sir?

Reportedly, from your security authorities, 60 percent of the captured arms and ammunition bear Western countries brand names and serial numbers. In tracing some bona fide Argentine-manufactured firearms, you found that on questioning the Argentine Government, these weapons were ordered and delivered to the Bulgarians.

Dr. YALCIN. Yes.

Senator DENTON. And those weapons were found in the hands of your terrorists in Turkey.

As to the 60 percent of the arms and ammunition bearing brand names and serial numbers from Western countries, your authorities are informing you that most of them were not manufactured in those countries but bear counterfeit brand imprints.

One example was some French weapons—pistols of the Unique brand—which proved to be imitations of the originals. In the other case, the Italian Berettas not only were imitations but the Italian police had in their possession weapons with the same serial numbers on them, doubly proving the allegation that they were imitations; is that correct, sir?

Dr. YALCIN. That is correct.

Senator DENTON. Thank you. Please go ahead.

Dr. YALCIN. Another interesting example of this obvious involvement in Turkish terrorism is a serial in one of our biggest national dailies, Hurriyet, which published a series of feature articles on the arms smuggling, with quite detailed history as well as quite a number of interesting pictures.

Some of the arms smuggling mafia from Turkey had established a very profitable partnership with certain Bulgarian State agencies of foreign trade.

The target and aim of this partnership was obviously to arm and to smuggle illegally arms into Turkey.

FOREIGN TRAINING OF TERRORISM

Another interesting evidence of this involvement was an open statement on the Turkish radio and the television on the 2d of March by one of the Marxist-Kurdish cessationists who was in-

volved in quite a number of killings in eastern Turkey. He said that he and his friends had training in Palestinian camps, and they had financial and otherwise support from friendly Socialist countries.

This statement was heard by millions of Turkish people.

According to Turkish newspaper information, as well as some information given to me by our officials, the Turkish terrorists are trained mainly in two Palestinian camps, controlled by either George Habbash or a Syrian guerrilla movement, Al Saika.

According to what I was told, more than 300 Turkish guerrillas are still in training. The Turks number second to the Arabs trained in these camps.

When this problem is raised with the representative of the PLO in Ankara, he gives very unconvincing answers, saying that they are being trained to combat Zionism. They cannot control them after their training—for what cause they will combat.

Originally, they are being trained to combat Zionism, which is not a very convincing argument.

As I referred in my beginning statement, another guerrilla movement, claiming to represent Armenian people, Asala, is based in Lebanon in the areas controlled by the PLO.

In one of the joint press conferences, communicated by international press agencies, they said that they are fighting to get back their lost land in the eastern provinces of Turkey.

When he was questioned about whether they were also fighting against Soviet Russia, he said: In Soviet Russia, an Armenian fighting against Soviet Russia is out of the question. What we are interested in is to get back our former lands from eastern Turkey.

INDIRECT OR PROXY AGGRESSION

When I referred in my opening statement to a proxy repetition of the same demand, addressed to Turkey in 1946, he made the repetition of the same demand—the same provinces demanded by Soviet Russia in 1946, this time not by Molotov but by Asala, which is a Marxist-Leninist-Armenian terrorist group which claims responsibility for the killings of about 18 Turkish diplomats, as you pointed out.

Senator DENTON. The same provinces that were being demanded by the Soviet Union during the time at which you received the aid of the Truman doctrine are now being demanded by the Marxist-Armenian terrorists; is that correct?

Dr. YALCIN. Yes, Mr. President.

The demand was expressed in 1946. Turkey expressed its resolution to resist against it. We said we were going to fight; we shall never accept the cessation of Turkish territory.

Western states, the Allies of the Second World War, especially the United States, came out with a statement by then-President Truman in April 1947. After seeing the Turkish resolution to defend herself, he said: "We are going to defend countries who defend their freedom and their independence. We shall be by their side. We shall do everything possible to help."

Senator DENTON. This name Habash is a relatively common name. Is this the same George Habash who worked with the notorious Feltrinelli and is the same George Habash who has come up so

many times in this hearing involved with the PFLP camps in Lebanon?

Dr. YALCIN. Yes, Mr. Chairman; that is correct.

In a statement given to the Middle East Review, carried by the Turkish daily Tercuman, on the 20th of June, 1981, an Asala leader of the Armenian terrorist organization said: "We are fighting for the same cause with the Turkish terrorist and the Kurdish terrorists."

This confirms our diagnosis that Armenian terrorists, who claim responsibility for nearly 60 attacks against Turkish targets, as well as the assassination of 18 Turkish diplomats, have been part of a larger picture of international terrorism instigated and heavily supported by the countries of Eastern Europe.

In the cities of evidences, perhaps I should mention particularly the psychological warfare mechanism directed against Turkey through a front organization of international communism, supported very closely by Soviet Russia, such as the World Peace Council, whose president is an Indian Communist. He is a member of the National Executive of the Indian Communist Party.

In one of their recent meetings in northern Europe—in Scandinavia, in Stockholm, I believe—they decided to start a solidarity movement with Turkish Democrats persecuted by the military Fascist regime of the present military commanders which had to intervene to stop the bloodshed in Turkey.

The Turkish Communist Party clandestine radio, which operates from East Berlin, constantly transmits subversive propaganda against Turkey. They have supported very closely internal uprisings tried by certain terrorist groups, as well as a Marxist trade union organization in Turkey. They clashed 2 years ago in Ismir in a big factory.

When this clash between the security authorities and small Marxist groups was going on, this Communist radio instigated very openly—and we have the transcript of their appeals—so it is obvious that this Soviet-supported Eastern Berlin Communist radio is still operating, expressing sympathy and expressing solidarity with Turkish terrorists.

Of course, when we approach the Soviet Government and other Eastern European surrogates, they deny any involvement.

SOVIET DUPLICITY

I would like to illustrate one very interesting conversation which was communicated to me by the former Prime Minister of Turkey, Mr. Demirel. It was in the time of a closer relationship between Soviet Russia and Turkey. We exchanged mutual trips and mutual visits. I, myself, went on one of these trips.

Mr. Kosygin asked Mr. Demirel if there was anything which he could do to improve the mutual relationship. Is there anything which disturbs you in the way of this closer friendship?

Mr. Demirel said: "No, Prime Minister; I have nothing to complain about." And he insisted.

Mr. Demirel, the Prime Minister of Turkey, said: "Mr. Prime Minister, as you insist so much, just one very unimportant thing occurred to me which I do not understand really and I should like to communicate.

"You talk about friendship and close cooperation and noninterference in neighboring countries. We know that a secret radio operating from Eastern Berlin is transmitting every day unspeakable abuse against myself and the Turkish Government and Turkish institutions. That I cannot reconciliate with your statement."

Mr. Kosygin expressed surprise: "I did not know, Mr. Prime Minister. I shall look into it, and I shall communicate with you again."

He communicated after 2 days. He said: "We do not know about the existence of this radio."

This is just the situation in which we find ourselves. When we produce dozens of evidence, they disclaim any responsibility for it. It is up to you and up to the public opinion of the free world to judge by this evidence what they mean.

I do not know whether I have taken too much of your time, but I should like to give another aspect of the question which is how this thing happened; how this accelerated in the last few years.

I think, Mr. President, that there are quite a number of reasons which I can think of in order to explain this bloodshed. One is internal, certainly.

EXPLOITATION OF TURKISH INTERNAL DIFFICULTIES

Foreign powers found suitable ground to operate in Turkish lands among the Turkish people. After all, about 25,000 young people cooperated with an external power against their own country, against their own state, and against the regime in which they live.

Turkey is in a very delicate phase of her social-economic-moral development. It is a rapidly industrializing country. It is a rapidly developing and urbanizing country.

I gave quite a number of facts and figures in my written statement. I do not want to repeat them. However, in order to illustrate the scope of this question, I should perhaps mention that in 1950—30 years ago—about 5 million people were living in urban centers. It is now nearly 25 million people within a matter of one generation who have changed their whole way of life and their whole way of thinking and their professions, and so forth.

This traumatic inner development is one of the destabilizing factors which affects a sizable part of our population.

Another more medium-term development occurred in the economic field. As you know, Western economies were affected very badly after the oil shock of the mid-1970's. Turkey was growing by about 7 percent per annum—second to Japan in the rate of growth. It was industrializing, and the industrial sector became the leading sector of our economy.

This process slowed down and stopped after 1974. Unemployment, high inflation, foreign exchange crisis, shortages, and undercapacity operation of Turkish industry created a negative atmosphere in which the terrorists and the Marxists tried to exploit, saying: "You see, Turkey is doomed. It cannot recover. It is heading for disaster in this setup."

INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Another factor to my mind could be the international environment. I think in the seventies, the Western World was rudderless, as far as we can see. There was no leadership; there were conflicting interests within the family of free nations.

In order to illustrate this point more vividly, I should mention perhaps that the American people imposed an embargo on Turkey, which is an ally within NATO. The feeling of betrayal and the feeling of being let down and the feeling of isolation was an extremely suitable ground for Marxist propaganda, and this has contributed a great deal to today's violence, today's courage, and today's extraordinary truculence when they started.

We feel that the whole atmosphere is changing now. We feel that the international atmosphere is changing, and there is more effort on the part of Western nations, especially American people, to offer leadership for the free world. It is a very promising specter for us who are trying to save our freedom in collaboration with NATO.

This is perhaps the gist of what I had in mind, Mr. President. I shall be extremely happy to answer any questions you may direct to me.

Senator DENTON. Thank you.

In view of the chairman's presence, I would defer to him if he cares to ask you any questions and then to Senator East since he will not be able to stay here long.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I find the testimony very intriguing. I have no particular questions at this point; I just want to express my appreciation for the presence of these gentlemen this morning.

Senator DENTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Let me acknowledge again the importance of your leadership and, in my opinion, the relevance and the need for the look into terrorism which would not be taking place were it not for your thoughtfulness and initiative before I even arrived in this body and before Senator East did.

I would like to offer, for what it is worth, my own expression of admiration for that.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you very much.

Senator DENTON. Senator East?

Senator EAST. Thank you, Senator Denton.

I believe we have to vote very shortly, but I would like to underscore your remarks about Senator Thurmond's leadership. In particular, I would like to say how appropriate it was to create this subcommittee and appoint you as chairman of it.

You have undertaken a great service on this question of dealing with terrorism and security.

I would hope that you will continue this great work and this great leadership.

It occurs to me, in hearing the testimony this morning, plus the testimony you have earlier taken here, that one can, if one can look at all the evidence, discern a pattern of terrorism in the world—a pattern that is designed clearly and so frequently to promote ideological and national aims. It varies in its scale of intensity from very small, isolated items to massive scales.

It is not an exaggeration to say, I do not think, quite unique to our time and to our century. Totalitarian governments, be they Nazi or Communist, have employed this technique. The 20th century has been dogged with it and will probably continue to be dogged with it for the balance of this century.

I know you and I have talked about it and do feel that the great purpose of this subcommittee can be to bring out the roots of this particular problem to show what sort of threat it represents—not only to the rest of the world, which is very important, but what it can ultimately mean in terms of security and well-being of the United States.

We have an obligation in the U.S. Senate and in the Judiciary Committee in particular to make sure that we understand the nature of this problem and that we have balanced and extensive hearings into the nature of it and that we recommend to the full Senate whatever corrective action is needed in order that we can deal with this in the long run, which could take many shapes, forms, and sizes. We will wait to see what that may be once the evidence is in.

Again, I do commend you. I am honored to be a part of this subcommittee in getting this initial testimony which will establish the patterns, I think. It is clear from testimony today, for example. Then we can move on into these other areas.

I did want to say that. I look forward to continued service with you here on the subcommittee.

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Chairman, could I just ask one or two questions here?

Senator DENTON. Yes, sir.

Senator THURMOND. In your statement you have discussed terrorism in Turkey. You have told how some of these people were trained in Lebanon; you have told of Armenians being involved; and you have given other examples.

Is there any question in your mind that the root of this trouble stems from Soviet policies? In other words, do you feel that the trouble you had in Turkey was exported there from the Soviet Union or that the Soviet Union is attempting to practice terrorism in the various countries of the world?

DEEP ROOTS OF SOVIET INVOLVEMENT

Dr. YALCIN. Yes, Senator.

I think there are quite a number of reasons for it. Turkey's armed forces are second to the United States within the NATO alliance. Turkey is a member of the family of Western nations. We are a founding member of the Council of Europe. We are an associate member of the European Economic Community. We are a member of the Organization of Economic Development [OECD]. We are also a member of the Islamic Nations Conference.

It is very strategic—not only from a real estate point of view but also psychologically and politically. Turkey occupies a very interesting link between the West and the East.

I should also perhaps mention the fact that there is a very sizable population within Soviet Russia that I observed when I accompanied the Turkish Prime Minister in Soviet Russia. They are extremely careful and extremely curious about Turkey—how

Turkey is doing; how it is progressing; what kind of political social system it is following.

The Islamic and Turkish population is now 27 percent of the whole Soviet population. It is nearly 72 million people with whom we have historical, cultural, linguistic, and religious links.

Turkey in the eyes of Soviet Russia is an extremely important country—much more important than the strategic geographical position. Psychologically and morally, it is a very important country.

If Turkey becomes a successful model of social development and a free representative democratic country, it is a bad example for the whole Marxist propaganda throughout the world.

We feel that Turkey is one of the main targets—not only from a military point of view but also from an ideological and social point of view.

Senator THURMOND. The question I am getting at is to what do you attribute terrorism in Turkey? Is the root of it coming from the Soviet Union? Are they the ones inspiring this terrorism in Turkey and other places throughout the world?

Dr. YALCIN. The Soviets are extremely careful not to get caught being involved directly. They do it indirectly through proxies and surrogate states, such as Bulgaria, the PLO, and Syria, with whom the Soviet Union has very close links.

Through them, the Turkish terrorists get financing, technical training, armaments, and moral support.

In that sense, I refer to Soviet involvement.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you very much.

I believe we have to go and vote now

Senator DENTON. Yes, sir. We will have to go vote.

We will recess this hearing until 11 o'clock. We stand in recess. Thank you, gentlemen, for waiting.

[Recess taken.]

IMPRESSIVE TURKISH INTERNAL DEVELOPMENTS

Senator DENTON. We will resume the hearing.

Your statement, Professor Yalcin, is so comprehensive and to the point that we will have fewer than the usual number of questions. You have added to our information in this investigation in an extremely important way.

I want to make several comments on your written, as well as your verbal, statement. You mentioned several examples of the progress of Turkey, which progress has been handicapped by the terrorist influence.

In deference to fairness, I would point out the remarkable fact that between 1950 and 1975, the rate of literacy, as you have indicated in your written remarks, was from 33.6 percent to 62 percent, which I think is most remarkable in any time frame in any part of the world.

It is so tragic that when such progress is being made in a nation, and yours is not the only one making progress, at the very time you are making the progress the terroristic effort is if not controlled by, at least, is supported by and indirectly used by the Soviet Union, as you say partly for the psychological purpose of

preventing the exemplary progress from contradicting their theme that one must go Communist to succeed.

I feel a great sense of respect and fellowship with you—not only in NATO but in the sense of trying to proceed with the march of civilization, as you have done in such admirable fashion in your own nation.

Your Prime Minister's talk with Mr. Kosygin is not one that is difficult for me to interpret. I hope it becomes one which is less difficult for all of our people to interpret.

Indeed, I hope that your testimony, particularly your written testimony, finds its just place in our media; because a rise in public consciousness is necessary to support government policy to cope with terrorism and to prevent within the United States the knee-cappings and the slaughter and the chaos which has taken place in Turkey as well as the policies necessary to help our friends, such as you, repell it. That public consciousness, as you know, is an extremely important factor.

I hope that your testimony is handled with the proportion of attention which it so clearly deserves.

Would you care to isolate perhaps the steps which lead you to the conclusion that foreign groups or states, particularly the Soviet Union, supported terrorist groups in Turkey, beginning with the Soviet pressure directly placed upon Turkey in the year 1946 and the evolution of that into using terrorism, particularly Armenian terrorism, for the same purposes. Would you give your evaluation of the degree to which this support for terrorism through surrogates has become a relatively new and major factor in Soviet policy.

TERRORISM AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO DIRECT AGGRESSION

Dr. YALCIN. Mr. Chairman, when one way is blocked, it is a natural instinct to try alternatives. Open aggression against Turkey is out of the question because it brings unforeseen consequences. With Turkey being a NATO ally, it might bring unforeseen consequences for the whole world, including the Soviets.

In military doctrine, and as a former military man you know much better than I, we hear that there are grades of pressure in the classical sense of the strategist Clausewitz.

There are quite a number of alternatives for pressure. War is one of them and internal subversion. Proxy aggression is an alternative. Failing in one way, one is bound to try at least other alternatives.

We feel that this alternative, which is internal subversion, will prove to be a failure. I am sure with better understanding of this problem throughout the world and also the resolution of the Turkish nation to settle this question speedily, effectively, and in an orderly manner, Turkey will transform herself again and restore her free institutions and parliamentary system and multiparty system which we are going to start very soon. I think it will show to adversaries that even these alternatives will not be successful.

I shall feel extremely gratified if we can help in a humble way to arouse world public opinion that this kind of pressure is no solution to any problem, except to kill innocent people and to leave

hardship and hatred and suffering. It is not a rational way of doing things.

Mr. President, your committee is doing an extremely important function in educating and informing not only American public opinion but also the world public opinion.

We in Turkey are much better informed of what is at stake. I am afraid that the free world is not yet fully aware of this new danger. I have a feeling that perhaps America is now changing. She has become more aware of the dangers. In Western Europe there is less consciousness of this thing.

Through exchanging our mutual experiences, we can perhaps educate the public opinion of the free world in order to serve as a deterrent, as NATO is a very effective deterrent.

This common stand by the free nations by common diagnosis and by common conclusion about our measures will play a very important role in deterrence for this new kind of aggression which is called in military terms a middle-level conflict and a middle-level indirect aggression.

Your committee is doing, in my humble judgment, an extremely important function to start countervailing power to stop this bloodshed.

THE ROLE OF THE MEDIA

Senator DENTON. Thank you, sir.

The degree to which we can affect public consciousness will depend on the degree to which the testimonies here are imparted through the media.

I not only respect our media, but I consider them as essential to democracy as government. I do have the feeling that there are many who find themselves in the position of trying to keep government honest, as it were. They can sometimes become understandably enthusiastic about challenging efforts made by government to lead toward a higher understanding within the country of things which the government originates.

I am trying, as best I can, to rely upon sources within our own media for some of the leads. Eventually, we will get to some of those.

For example, our media had taken the lead in pointing out the export illegally of technology from the United States, which is to our great security disadvantage. We intend to get around to that sort of thing when we can.

Did you notice in Turkey's traumatic experiences through the 1970's and up until now that the reality and the immediacy of the terrorism in Turkey altered the slant, let's say, that some of the truly conscientious, which are the extreme majority of the media, took within Turkey toward these problems?

Dr. YALCIN. I think our media has done an extremely valuable job of informing Turkish public opinion.

There was very detailed honest reporting of what was going on. The government security authorities supplied any information they needed.

As a former politician, I get around and talk to people like shopkeepers and taxi drivers and peasants. To my surprise, their sound commonsense is much more strong than the urban people—the so-called educated, intellectual people.

Both mass media—Turkish radio as well as Turkish television—and especially the Turkish press, gave very extensive coverage to this question. It has been a very important democratic education of what is going on. Turkish public opinion is much more informed than it was a year or 2 years ago.

I hope that the same thing happens in the free world. I have every confidence that one way or another the prejudices will break down and people will look at things with an open mind.

ELECTORAL IMPOTENCY OF MARXISM

Senator DENTON. I share that hope fervently.

I note the remarkable discrepancy between the influence of Marxist-oriented terrorism in Turkey, in terms of the disturbance and influence they can cause by violence, and the 2.6 percent of the popular vote which went Marxist in Turkey. That seems to be a characteristic internationally. I do not know of any nation which has voted to go Marxist.

Dr. YALCIN. Turkish democracy has given every chance to every kind of opinion to influence public opinion.

I had a very interesting conversation with one of the leading intellectuals of the Marxist groups, who was also a member of Parliament like myself and a colleague of mine and a former professor of economics.

He said that they used mass media more extensively than the Justice Party, which represented the majority party which I represented at that time. Yet they were unable to influence Turkish public opinion.

As an electoral force, Marxism is not a threat to Turkey. However, as an illegal, undercover, and violent underground action, it is a great danger.

Probably, in their frustration of democratic politics, most of the Marxists stray toward violence in their frustration—just like the frustration experienced by Warsaw Pact countries. Finding open aggression not out of the question, they have to resort to some other alternatives. I think the same pattern is duplicated within Turkish internal Marxism.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to give you my long-term estimate. I have had quite a number of former students of mine who happened to be involved in this violence. Most of them repented.

I hope that the young generation which went astray will recover their commonsense and repent the mistakes they have made and the harms they have done, and it will be an educative process. This is my hope and expectation.

Senator DENTON. I have watched my own children undergo that kind of change. Returning to this country in 1973 and finding that calm discourse between some of them and myself was impossible on some of these issues, I simply remained silent; 3 years or so later, I found them through their own experiences—often overseas and often just from their observations within this country—becoming proponents of the same points that I would have propounded in those days had we been able to discourse.

I share your optimism, as well as hope, on that point.

As a man as scholarly rooted as yourself, I humbly would check one of my own impressions on you that following World War II in

which we were allies with the Soviet Union, they did not abandon their 1917 expressed ambition for expansion—indeed, world domination. However, where they had large Army forces already located and stationed within Eastern European nations, they held false elections and took those nations over. As you indicate, they are having difficulties in keeping some of them down—Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary having been the main examples—Poland being the principal one at this moment.

They tried at the same time guerrilla-type pressure on Turkey and Greece, which was answered by your own very brave people who are respected by both the free world and the Communist world as among the strongest fighters in the world. I say that as a military man of experience.

The Truman doctrine helped you and helped Greece in that respect. The formation of NATO definitely helped stem the expansion in Western Europe and in southern Europe. The Eisenhower doctrine was a parallel to the Truman doctrine in the Mideast. Then there was the shift to surrogate military conventional aggression in Korea. I think events proved this in Vietnam.

What bothers me is that after those recourses to more subtle forms of expansion, such as subversion and surrogate aggression, after the U.S. experience in Vietnam, we had recourse to direct aggression by a major power—namely, the Soviet Union in Afghanistan—which was a reversal of the trend, in my view, starting in the late 19th century by which the community of nations recognized that there were better means of solving world problems than the enforcement of the rule, "might makes right."

There should be inhibition against overt military aggression and resolution of the problem by recourse to such institutions as The Hague Tribunal and later the League of Nations with its embedded inhibition of economic sanctions against an identified aggressor.

As a scholar of that general subject, I am disappointed in the United States. We are now aware that as weak and incomplete a process as the League represented, although the United States was not a member, historians can point out 72 wars which would have broken out were it not for the League of Nations.

I find it frustrating to be seen as a military-solution type when most regular military officers, including myself—that having been my former profession—are among those most opposed to having to resort to military solutions.

The United Nations came along with the additional inhibition against aggression of the imposition of military force by the United Nations. Of course, there is the problem that one major party in the United Nations and one major philosophical group has no interest whatever in the noble aims of the United Nations, in terms of inhibiting aggression.

AFGHANISTAN: A NEW VICTIM OF DIRECT AGGRESSION

It strikes me as very disappointing and ominous that the Afghanistan aggression was met with such weak response, even in terms of the vocal condemnation on the part of the rest of the community of nations. I parallel that increased risk in the chess game from the Soviets' point of view with their increased boldness in the terrorism field.

I would like to compare those observations with your own analysis, sir.

Dr. YALCIN. The experience of Afghanistan awakened some parts of Turkish public opinion because of certain frustrations among which I mentioned American arms embargo, which created a kind of adverse feeling in our nation.

There is a certain amount—very limited though—of tendency toward neutralism.

The example of Afghanistan helped to kill this tendency among certain layers of people in Turkey. The Islamic world feels very strongly, although militarily it cannot be of great help to come to the aid of Afghanistan. Psychologically and morally I think Soviet aggression created a very great impact within the Islamic world, Mr. President. That I can assure you.

A very young and very pleasant Afghan student of mine I asked what he was going to do. He said as soon as he graduated he would go and join the guerrillas. He was a young graduate with a family.

In a very modest way, without any pompous feeling of nationalism, and so forth, he said his plan was to go back to Pakistan and join the resistance.

There is a very strong undercurrent movement among the Islamic people that this adventure on the part of Soviet Russia has become a real and very close threat for the whole region.

RIGHT AND LEFT WINGS IN TERRORISM

Senator DENTON. In your written testimony, you made reference to the relative success being enjoyed recently in Turkey with respect to putting down terrorism. You make some remarks about the present state of right and left wing terrorism. Would you care to expound on that now in your verbal testimony?

Dr. YALCIN. Mr. Chairman, I think the evolution of this rightwing and leftwing terrorism in Turkey went hand in hand as a result of the weakening of governmental authorities throughout the country.

When the people felt the threat of one group, they could not get immediate help from the police or from the administration. The leftwing guerillas, knowing the situation, approached them. If they were threatened by the rightwing, they approached the person threatened and said: "We shall protect you—join us, contribute money, and get certain duties from us. Wait for our instructions," and so forth.

This rightwing and leftwing violence snowballed. It became a part of the feedback mechanism to accelerate the rate of violence.

Most of the young people, feeling the impotency of the security authorities and the administration, very nearly cooperated with the rightwing groups, although they were conscious of the danger. Once you get yourself involved, you cannot leave it. It is impossible.

Fortunately, when the new government was installed on the 20th of September, the rightwing terrorist groups were disbanded. Most of them who were involved in killings were rounded up. There were about a few thousand rightwing groups. The proportion is 1 to 10—1 rightwing and 10 leftwing terrorists.

The rationale or justification of their existence vanished all of a sudden, so there is no rightwing terrorist attack ever recorded in the Turkish newspaper.

Senator DENTON. Did you notice any difference in the apparent outside support fed to rightwing versus leftwing terrorists?

Dr. YALCIN. I think rightwing terrorists were mostly domestic in origin. They were supported financially by the small shopkeepers or by simple people who felt threatened by the leftwing and sympathized. There was a backlash of Turkish nationalism.

The threat of Soviet Russia, as communicated by the leftwing terrorists, created a backlash on the part of all Turkish nationalist feeling.

The question is now to round up and liquidate the remnants of certain underground organizations.

INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON

Senator DENTON. Are you familiar with the book "The Terror Network," by Claire Sterling?

Dr. YALCIN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I became aware for the first time when a Turkish newspaper serialized the part dealing with Turkey. That part is extremely accurate. It is very balanced and extremely illuminating.

We learned a few things in a perspective. We could not fit into a pattern some of the points which Claire Sterling's book contributed.

I have not finished it yet, but I have come to the last chapters. It is extremely illuminating.

I have noted certain extraordinary parallels between Turkish terrorists, ETA's, Spanish terrorists, Italian Red Brigades, IRA, and the Baader-Meinhof terrorism.

The doctrine, style, infrastructure, ideology, and the logistics involved are extremely similar to our case.

I think Mrs. Sterling's book is a great contribution to understanding the whole picture. It enabled us to piece together certain gaps which puzzled us in Turkey. It has been a great help.

Senator DENTON. Her characterization in her book of the situation in Turkey was not inaccurate from your perspective?

Dr. YALCIN. No, not at all. It is very accurate.

Senator DENTON. She mentions an extensive and apparently successful disinformation campaign conducted by the Soviet KGB between 1966 and 1970 against the American NATO presence in Turkey. This was accomplished in part, according to her, by the introduction of three forged documents. Would you comment, if you can, on this or any other disinformation operations and their effect on Turkey?

Dr. YALCIN. Mr. Chairman, there are so many. These are just a few examples which came to the attention of Mrs. Sterling.

In Turkey, there are so many that I cannot really enumerate. Fortunately, enjoying a free press in Turkey, some of this disinformation becomes identified easily.

One of the famous disinformation attempts was in connection with a book published by an unelected Senator, an appointed Senator, and a former leftwing military person. He claimed that there existed a CIA, or American Government, document to eliminate

certain progressive liberal democratic intellectuals in Turkey. It was so preposterous and it was so artificial that nobody really paid much attention. It became a kind of theme, repeated continuously by leftwing commentators and writers. Everybody knew that it was a tactic, and nobody paid much attention.

There was also another disinformation thing during the Turkish-Greek dispute. In order to intensify the antagonism between Turks and Greeks, quite a bit of fabricated inaccurate information used to be leaked to Turkish press. It was not only to Turkish press. I was told also by the officials that certain unfounded and ungrounded information was supplied by people to create ill feeling between Turkey and Greece.

RIGHTWING TERRORISTS AS COVER

Senator DENTON. The attempted assassination of the Pope involves a man who reportedly has rightwing connections—Mehmet Ali Agca. He seems to have been possessed of a great deal of money without any visible means of earning it and to have survived against the surveillance efforts of many nations, in spite of his having been very well identified by your own authorities.

How would you see the establishment of his credentials, whether they are determinatively rightwing or leftwing. Would you have any comments on what the Turks might care to say about his activities and the nature of his motivations?

Dr. YALCIN. Mr. President, I do not know much about the recent activities of Mehmet Ali Agca who attempted to assassinate the Pope. I can perhaps communicate to you our general impression and observation.

He is an extraordinary character, from the very beginning, when he was involved in the killing of the editor of a newspaper, which is a very respectable newspaper. My wife works there. She is a diplomatic correspondent in Ankara.

His reputation was that he belonged to a rightwing group of the underground world. The killing of a respected and very influential liberal editor of the Istanbul Daily, a national daily, created an image that he was a rightwing fanatic.

From what we heard about his past, his personality, and his background, he was not a fanatic at all. He was not a practicing Moslem. He did not much care about religion. He was a professional killer with the utmost self-control. He was a very premeditated person whom anybody could manipulate easily.

This is the picture one gets from the Turkish press reports after his escape from prison and the death sentence given by the court. We do not know who helped him, but he escaped from prison. I was told that he went to Iran where nobody is governing. I think it is a chaotic situation. I do not know who helped Mehmet Ali Agca in Iran.

He came back to Turkey with a forged passport, and he went to Bulgaria. For a rightwing extremist to go to Bulgaria is suicide.

That struck our attention. It was a very strange phenomenon for a rightwing terrorist to pass through as a transit from Bulgaria. It aroused quite a bit of speculation and suspicion. I do not know who is manipulating whom.

The Pope is a symbol of Polish nationalism. To be assassinated by a Turk might fit into a grand picture or a grand design of anti-Turkish propaganda accusing our people of committing genocide against Christian minorities.

These are my purely speculative thoughts out of the circumstantial evidence. I do not think he is a representative of rightwing terrorists. Rightwing terrorists are rather amateurs. They get caught very easily by the security. They are not as efficient as Mehmet Ali Agca.

Senator DENTON. It was Dr. Stefan Possony at our last hearing who went through a rather long history of the development of Soviet philosophy regarding terrorism. At the point of his conclusion, there were no more press here, understandably, because they have deadlines and so forth.

He made the same point, as I recall. After going through his analysis of this gentleman, he noted too that although he has the rightwing image, it was rather anomalous that he visited Bulgaria. He then developed the qui bono question, and there was not much doubt about the inference which he was drawing.

We will be asking other witnesses the same kinds of questions dealing with the attempted assassination of the Pope.

ASSASSINATION OF TURKISH DIPLOMATS

Have you caught any of the terrorists who killed the 18 Turkish diplomats?

Dr. YALCIN. As far as I know, one assassination took place in this country years ago; I think in 1972 or 1973. He was caught.

The last one occurred in Geneva in Switzerland. He was caught. We are waiting with great curiosity the story behind it.

So far, we really do not know about the culprits or about their background or about their organization. Probably this time we shall hear more.

Senator DENTON. I did note that in one of the cases in which you caught an attempted assassin, he said he had been given the weapon by someone who was not even able to speak Turkish. You have not ascertained where these fellows are coming from or, particularly, by whom they are being supplied any weapons or philosophy. You are still investigating that; is that correct?

Dr. YALCIN. No. That happened years ago.

Senator DENTON. Oh, I know.

Dr. YALCIN. The first assassination of the general commander of the Gendarmerie.

Senator DENTON. Yes; that was the example I referred to.

On these others, the diplomats' assassins, you are still investigating them and have very little to report about them?

Dr. YALCIN. In diplomats' assassinations, we are not involved in the investigation because it concerns other countries. We follow with great interest what will come out.

Unfortunately, most of the investigations were inconclusive, except the last one when the person who attempted the assassination got caught by the police in Switzerland.

DISAPPOINTMENT OF TERRORISTS' EXPECTATIONS

Senator DENTON. In looking at the experience of Turkey and comparing it to the experience in Uruguay with terrorism, it seems you have been able to avoid—I will not beg the question by saying "unfortunate"; it might have been inevitable—but at least the undesirable solution which the Uruguayans imposed; namely, an extremely authoritarian military regime with the loss of many liberties which existed prior to the terroristic activities.

The military in Turkey, in other words, has not responded to the terrorism in the way anticipated and hoped for by the terrorists, either in 1960 or 1971 or 1980, when it became necessary for the military to intervene to restore and maintain order.

The military intervened to rescue the country with a commitment to lift martial law and hold national elections once order was restored and terrorism brought under control, rather than to replace Turkey's democratic order. Terrorists from all factions were arrested and imprisoned and not just those from one persuasion.

Would you comment on what appears to be a notably different response, considering the way some of the South American terroristic events have culminated—the unique response by the Turkish military in response to terrorism?

Dr. YALCIN. Mr. Chairman, the doctrine is quite the same in quite a number of these terrorist strategies. Most of the South American terrorist handbooks are translated into Turkish.

In Marighella's book the aim is expressed to destroy democracy and show to the people the sham aspect of bourgeoisie and so-called freedom and create within the society a distrust and frustration as a result of strong military action. That was the general strategy.

However, in the Turkish case, this did not work. First, our military is not interested in domestic politics. They have proved this point. They intervened in 1960 and withdrew in a matter of a year and a half by constitutional amendments and by rearranging our social and political institutions.

That happened again in 1971, when the military did not intervene directly. They expressed their frustration and protested in such a way that the civilian government had to resign. The Parliament was not dismissed, and the whole democratic structure was operating.

We had a few limited reforms in our legislation as a result of this event. However, this time, the scope of the question was much bigger than in the previous ones; because the killings and the network of terrorist activities became more enlarged. The terrorists learned a lot about their past mistakes, and they did not repeat them this time.

Again, their anticipation did not materialize. First, it was not convincing for either Turkish public opinion or international public opinion that it was a simple sheer military dictatorship—a kind of totalitarian regime to be followed by this military intervention.

Second, the population at large, which is a very important thing for any country facing terrorism, was so furious and so antiterrorist and so hostile to this violent group that even in Eastern Turkey where some of the Marxist terrorists claimed to be representing the feeling of independence of Kurds, and so forth, the Kurdish

people followed them and caught them and delivered them to the gendarmerie.

The close cooperation between the security authorities and the military and the civilian population has been a disappointment for the terrorists.

A PEOPLE'S WAR AGAINST THE TERRORISTS

Turkish people did not just stand aside as passive observers. They participated to defend their state and to defend their freedom and to defend their social, economic, and political system. It was a people's war against the terrorists. The whole tables turned upside down.

The foreign reaction was also not in the way they expected. They expected that the Western democracies would revolt at the destruction by the military of a Turkish civilian regime.

I think the foreign reaction—our allies' reaction—was extremely positive, because they understood immediately that the question was not doing away with the civilian regime but the question was about to deal with the threat to the civilian regime and to the Turkish democracy.

These terrorists were more or less isolated. Only the Soviet fronts cooperate with them in Western Europe. Extreme left wing groups give them any moral support. It gives a feeling of solidarity.

They are also disappointed in their calculation of the worldwide reaction against Turkey.

STRENGTHENING OF TURKISH DEMOCRACY

We feel that the military will decide, which will be very soon, to start with the Constituant Assembly to draw up a new constitution for the Turkish democracy.

I think the wind from the sails of these people, trying to lead psychological warfare against Turkey, will be denied when Turkey prepares herself again with a reformed constitution and with the necessary legislative rearrangement for our future.

We have observed that our previous political system had certain extremely important defects. Probably, you will recall, Mr. President, that the Parliament was unable to elect the President for about 6 months after hundreds of votings. There was obviously a gap in our constitutional system.

We tried to experiment with extreme forms of proportional representation which gave undue force to marginal groups and to small groups to dictate their sectorial interests on the majority.

These kinds of defects became more obvious. Through a new amendment in our constitution, we are hoping that this political reform will enable Turkish democracy to deal with any future attempt of terrorism and any future attempt of disruption of Turkish democracy.

Senator DENTON. You have, as noted, personally lived in the terroristic environment, as well as obviously being an intellectual academic man. You have discussed the political evolutions and public opinion evolutions that took place. Could you become more concrete regarding the events in Turkey, the terroristic events? What impact did they have on the personal lives of the citizens?

What changes were there in any of your citizens' habits, attitudes, and living patterns that have resulted from this terrible experience?

EFFECTS OF TERRORISM ON PEOPLE'S LIVES

Dr. YALCIN. Mr. President, I think from the observation I had, as well as my friend's observation in his university, that the quality of education dropped considerably. Serious people stopped attending lectures. There was bad feeling among the academic community. They did not communicate with each other.

In outside fields, people stopped going to public places. There was a kind of—not hopelessness—but a sort of pessimism about the future of the country. It was reported in Turkish newspapers that some of the investors just postponed their decisions, because the country was heading for chaos. In a chaotic situation, you cannot make any rational calculations of investment.

Economic goals and economic stability were threatened. There were continuous inflationary demands on the part of the Marxist trade union movement, disrupting the economy, announcing unofficial strikes, occupying industrial plants, and continuous demonstrations, and so forth.

That affected the population very deeply. It did not drive it to hopelessness, but there was a kind of hesitation and a kind of doubt about the future of the country that was being created in the minds of quite a number of people.

On the whole, we felt that the whole thing was so artificial that somehow or another the Turks would deal with the situation and the Army, which has a history of 600 years of dedication and discipline and devotion to the motherland, would intervene. People in general and peasants in villages felt that one way or another the state would prevail. That was the general mood I think.

My colleague here perhaps might add his own assessment and his own observation.

Dr. OKYAR. May I?

Senator DENTON. Yes, sir, by all means, Dr. Okyar.

Dr. OKYAR. I agree with Dr. Yalcin's assessment.

We lived in a very confused kind of world, a confusion which I think was increased by political troubles. Political troubles stemmed from too much animosity between the two leaders of our political parties.

The animosity went to very great extremes, leading to accusations, counteraccusations, charges of one party being closely related to one side on the right and the other party being closely related to the other side, on the left.

This very bad political leadership, I would say, led to confusion in the minds of the people as to the sources of the trouble. They could not know very much what was going on.

It also created a very bad situation in the universities where we were both working, because the students were encouraged in their terrorist actions by this political uncertainty. They said that if this is the way the political system is working and if this is the way the democratic institutions are functioning or are not functioning—because they were not functioning for a year or two—then why not resort to terrorism or to violence.

Senator DENTON. Which is the intended development of actions inscribed in the minimanual for urban guerrilla warfare.

Dr. OKYAR. Yes.

Senator DENTON. That is shared by all those trainees throughout the world who are undertaking this terrorism.

It is a very difficult thing to stem, particularly, I would think, in a smaller country with less psychological solidarity and less determination, if I may say so, than that possessed by the Turkish people.

Dr. OKYAR. Yes.

To have resisted this crisis situation, which in addition was compounded by the inflation and economic difficulties for 2 or 3 years, speaks I think to the capacities and the strengths of the people in Turkey.

The people never realized what was happening. They only realized it after the 12th of September, when night after night on the television we watched with horror every day new groups, new cells, and new gangs being discovered and a fantastic quantity of arms, almost sufficient to equip an army corps—600,000 revolvers and machine guns and 30,000 rifles.

This finally brought down the veil and educated the people as to the source of the trouble.

Senator DENTON. I do not want to let it be derived that I personally believe that the Soviet Union masterminded or originated some of the causes or the friction in Turkey, nor do I believe that to be the case anywhere in the world.

I regret that the first day's hearing resulted in the news item being that I failed to prove that. I was amazed at that finding, because I did not believe that going in because I had read the statements of the four witnesses. I had my own opening statement which indicated that.

I was most disappointed to find that that was the news item, rather than the degree to which those witnesses found the Soviet Union involved and the union of forces and philosophy involved worldwide in terrorism and the modus operandi which is common to them all.

It appears to me that that is the news, and we are trying to develop that in terms of public consciousness.

As I say to you, it takes two to tango on that. First there are those who try to bring out that which is significant in these hearings; then there are those who transmit that through the media. I have not lost hope or optimism that we shall succeed in that.

I do not pretend to be omniscient. I shall make some mistakes, but I am proceeding with the interests of happiness, peace, and justice in this hearing. I believe that applies to the Democrats and the Republicans on this committee as well.

Senator Leahy told me in the elevator that he is involved in other required activities. He spent a good deal of time recently with your highest officials in Turkey and was very much impressed with what they had to say about what you have been speaking this morning. He wished he could have been here with us.

I would like to thank you, again, Professor Yalcin, and you, Professor Okyar, for your most valuable testimony.

I would like to remind you that we will hold the record open for 10 days for the submission of written questions from other Senators or questions which we may raise ourselves which have not been answered, if you would be kind enough to respond to those. At this point we will also insert in the record your full statement, Dr. Yalcin.

We will convene another hearing tomorrow dealing with terrorism and the role of the Soviet Union and what could be called its subcontractors.

Our witness will be the editor of Foreign Report, a publication of the esteemed London Economist. He is the editor of Foreign Report, which is an arm of that.

Articles by him have appeared in the Washington Post, New York Times magazine, and other American publications. He is the author of two nonfiction books, "Urban Guerillas" and "The Collapse of Democracy." He is also the co-author of "The Spike."

His name is Mr. Robert Moss, and we are looking forward to his testimony tomorrow.

I thank you for your kind attention and participation.

This hearing stands adjourned.

Dr. YALCIN. Thank you.

Dr. OKYAR. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 12:10 p.m., the hearing recessed, to reconvene the next day at 9:30 a.m.]

[The prepared statement of Professor Yalcin follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PROF. AYDIN YALCIN

TERRORISM IN TURKEY

It is a pleasure, privilege and honor for me to share my knowledge of and views on terrorism with the representatives of a nation with whom we Turks are resolved to defend our freedoms through mutual common efforts within NATO. I have come here to give my testimony not as a government representative, but as an independent and informed citizen of a terrorism-stricken country which has suffered heavy casualties totalling 5,769 killed and 19,305 wounded since 1977 from terrorist violence. I should like also to point out that I shall speak here as a person who has first-hand experience with living in an atmosphere of constant terror in the last few years. Until September 12, 1980, the year of the Turkish military takeover, I had to have a personal bodyguard and my home was under official protection for a year and a half following several threats by phone and letters. Although I shall try to give an objective and systematic account of these personal and social experiences, it will be, I am sure, quite different from those arrived at by means of indirect reporting or statistical tabulations compiled from a distance.

As an educator and writer, as well as a former legislator, I shall try to convey to you some of the insights I have gained through this long period of agony during which we lost to senseless slaughter hundreds of prominent members of our society, great statesmen, ambassadors, journalists, professors, judges and thousands of young people.

BACKGROUND AND A SHORT HISTORY

In order to put things in a perspective, I should like to draw your attention to a few relevant facts about Turkey.

While possessing her own distinctive historical and cultural background, Turkey also is a sincere and devoted member of the community of nations of the free world. She is a member of the NATO Alliance, a founding member of the Council of Europe, an associate member of the European Economic Community and the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). She is the only country which at once belongs to the family of nations of the

Western world as well as Islamic community of nations. She also has cultural, historical, ethnic, religious and linguistic ties with the ethnic groups which constitute 27 percent of Soviet population according to its last census of 1979.

Through these special features of her national life, Turkey's experiences are quite relevant for a number of nations in the Middle East, the Islamic world and among the developing countries. The hardships, tensions, and dislocations caused by rapid industrialization and urbanization will serve as a test case or social laboratory for a number of nations in the future.

Turkey has been in the midst of rapid social and economic transformation in her recent history. The structure of the economy has changed radically in the last 25 years. Agriculture is no longer the leading sector of the economy and has dropped below the ratio of industry in our gross national product. Industry contributed nearly 25 percent of the GNP in 1978 against 22.7 percent for agriculture in the same year. Parallel with this development, urbanization surged ahead. Fifty percent of our population now lives in urban centers versus 25 percent in 1950. The number of people living in urban centers shot up from 5.2 million in 1950, to 22.5 million in 1980, increasing nearly five times within a period of 30 years. The rate of literacy rose from 33.6 percent in 1950 to 62 percent in 1975. The number of higher education institutions and student population also increased sharply. The number of universities increased from 5 to 20 between 1960 and 1980; and the number of university students rose from 50,000 to nearly 350,000 in the same period.

It may be helpful to bear in mind these summary indices of social transformation as I endeavor to analyze the travails Turkey is going through. These radical changes in our social structure and way of life have created conditions ideally suited to exploitation by forces both within and outside the country.

Marxism, a disease of Western industrial society, is really a disease of childhood rather than of maturity, as some social scientists and philosophers have pointed out. Yet, it has not failed to influence minds in certain sectors of our society. Despite such influence in certain circles, it has

proven to be an utter failure in generating strong mass support in our democratic politics. The Marxist Turkish Labour Party obtained the support of 2.9 percent of the vote in 1965 elections and the combined votes of all the Marxist splinter groups and parties failed to attain even this modest score in several subsequent elections.

As a result of this frustrating electoral experience, Marxist groups gradually tended towards political violence. The dwindling number of Marxists who went on trying to gain strength through the democratic process were even accused of betraying the cause of revolutionary ideology.

Student unrest spreading throughout the world in the late sixties had not failed to reach Turkey. It started in university campuses as mild educational reform movements and rapidly changed character. Boycotting of classes, occupation of university buildings and offices, escalated into violent clashes with the police and security forces. It is perhaps appropriate to note that this radicalization and politization of student movements gained momentum following the Havana Convention of "The Three Continents" in 1966, where the potential of the student force was emphasized.

The student violence spilled over to the labor sector in 1970 when a Marxist trade union (DISK, the Revolutionary Trade Union Confederation) organized a strike in Istanbul which quickly turned into a violent riot and forced the government to proclaim martial law in that province. Political kidnappings and assassinations followed one another in an ever-intensifying cycle of violence. The first Kalashnikov weapon made its debut on the scene of Turkish terrorism when a young student tried to assassinate the commander of the Gendarmery in 1972. The offender, who was captured, immediately confessed to the police that he had obtained this weapon in an apartment in downtown Ankara from somebody who did not even speak Turkish.

The terrorist activities accelerated in the early 1970's. The government, proving to be weak and inefficient, had to resign after an armed forces memorandum in March 1971. A non-partisan independent government was formed by the parliament and the martial law authorities dealt with the question of terror with speed and efficiency. By the 1973 elections, the military had withdrawn to their barracks, leaving the initiative to political parties

again. As the People's Republican Party, a left-of-center political force under the leadership of Bulent Ecevit, had come out with relative success in this election, it set up a coalition government which soon proclaimed an amnesty. Most of those convicted of political terror and violence were thus released, and they did not hesitate to get themselves rapidly organized to start their mission from where they had left off.

The regrouping of their cadres took less than two years, and their violent activity started surfacing from 1976 onwards. By gaining moral strength and enjoying the extreme liberal tendencies of the party of Mr. Ecevit, the Marxists managed to penetrate the civil service and even the police force. The People's Republican Party became infested by left-wing penetration after the 1977 general elections, when no single party obtained majority. Weak coalition governments followed one after another.

Law and order came to a point of total breakdown. The excesses of the Communist terror created a backlash from the extreme right. Both leftist and rightist groups were heavily armed and challenged each other in the streets, on the campuses, in the cafes. The formation of so-called "liberated zones" in towns and cities became a key goal for both left and right. A kind of feedback mechanism, or vicious circle, seemed to have been installed in the process of mutual killings of both extremists.

Mutual recrimination and continuous strife among the political parties prevented a common effort to deal effectively with the violence and contributed to the escalation of terror. In fact, the level of violence resembled, and for most practical purposes had become, civil war. People were massacred in the provincial towns of Malatya, Sivas, Corum, Kahraman, Maras and Izmir. On the eve of the 12th of September 1980, the day of military take-over, the daily rate of killing had attained an unbelievable 28 lives. It became obvious to everybody that events went beyond the scope of any conceivable civilian democratic solutions.

THE ROOTS AND SCOPE OF TERRORISM

The process of rapid social transformation of the past three decades, to which I referred earlier, went hand-in-hand with unhindered freedom of expression, association and action provided by the ultra-liberal Constitution

of 1961. Democratic liberties were exploited to a degree that made a mockery of the concept of freedom and the necessary self-restraint it implies. Under the pretext of pluralism and university autonomy, the university campuses became the refuge of outlaws and armament depots of urban guerillas. Freedom of association was interpreted in such a way as to permit organization of a Marxist police association (Pol-Der) which described the present social and economic system as "an exploitation device of the bourgoisie" in their publications. A rival right-wing police association (Pol-Bir) was also organized. These extremist organizations clashed in the streets and shot at each other instead of safeguarding law and order.

Communist propaganda and indoctrination were intensified during the last twenty years. A torrent of Marxist literature with the cheapest price tags became available to all in book stalls and side street vendors. "The Marxist classics" and "the books of the masters," Marx, Engels, Lenin, Kautsky, Luxembourg, Stalin, Trotsky, Mao, Dimitrof, Gramsci, etc., became familiar household names for the new generation of Marxists. Modern interpreters and theoreticians of the creed, such as Politzer, Althusser, P. Baran, P. Sweezy, M. Dobb, E. Mandel, Bettleheim, etc., were translated into Turkish within a short span of time.

According to Soviet sources, the annual number of new Marxist books published in Turkey varied between 50 and 90 in the second half of the sixties. A student of mine made a library research and identified about 760 entries of Marxist literature between 1960 and 1970, which supports the claim of the Soviet source. Marxist propaganda was also spread through 270 periodicals published before the 12th of September 1980. The author has identified 61 Marxist-leftist publishing houses, 8 distribution and marketing firms, several book stores specialized in Marxist literature and many record and tape recording houses of so-called "progressive and revolutionary song, music and poetry readings." Through these elaborate and extensive distribution and marketing systems, Marxist literature, including text-books for urban and rural guerillas like those of C. Guevera, Carlos Marigella, Alberto Mayo, General Giap, etc., became available to the public. There are even handbooks and manuals advising militants about tactics and behavior when captured by

the police and brought to the court, in order to confuse their investigators and to keep secrets of their organization. (I have elaborated these points in detail in my book, "Some Observations on Turkish Communism," published in Turkish).

Universities and the institutions of higher education, especially teacher training colleges, have become the main targets of Communist penetration, and a sizable group of Marxist intellectuals now occupy the academic staff of our elite institutions.

As an educator and writer, I have given serious thought to the question of the appeal of Marxism to certain of our young intellectuals. Marxism, as a crude interpretation of history and of current affairs of the contemporary world, has proven to be a useful substitute for sound and solid social science training. Modern democracies and the educated classes of the developing world have to meet the challenge posed by Marxism through an intensive effort of sound and high level training in the social sciences. I cannot see any other alternative to combat Marxist ideology and Communism on a moral and intellectual plane. I came to the conclusion that the best remedy to protect free society from the assaults of totalitarian ideologies of both right and left lies in raising the level of education and following a well-coordinated policy of sound education in the classicial tradition of democratic societies.

MECHANICS AND INFRASTRUCTURE OF TURKISH POLITICAL VIOLENCE

Turkey has been accumulating a very costly social experience in her efforts to deal with political violence. There is certainly plenty of circumstantial evidence of outside involvement in Turkish terrorism. But this should not blind us to the fact that about 25,000 of our young people in prisons today have become the target of outside intrigues and voluntary culprits of this bloody instigation. Therefore, the core of the solution resides with us, both Turks and our friends abroad. However, a balanced diagnosis and assessment of outside interference should be made clear and a system of dissuasion should be installed before the situation gets out of control.

As many well-informed analysts have pointed out in their accounts of

the problem, (Mrs. Claire Sterling in her book and television interviews makes this point quite clear), outside help and involvement come into the picture because the domestic scene is so well prepared and suitable for such an adventure. An ideal atmosphere had been created for intensifying terrorism in Turkey if we recall what had happened prior to the mid-seventies.

As a result of the oil crisis, Turkey's delicate balance of self-sustained growth came to a halt after 1974. Turkey's impressive rate of growth which was running around 7 percent per annum (next to Japan within OECD) dropped to almost nil in the second half of the decade. The foreign exchange reserves accumulated in the previous few years were speedily drained away. Investment stopped and unemployment spread in many sectors. The American arms embargo created a feeling of isolation and resentment against the West. Anti-American, anti-NATO and anti-Western propaganda intensified in the meantime. The Soviets and their stooges in the outlawed Turkish Communist Party declared Turkey, Iran, Pakistan the "weak links in the chain of international imperialism."

Turkey, a NATO Ally with the largest land army (around 600,000) next to that of the U.S., became an indirect target of a Soviet offensive. The American arms embargo was interpreted by Warsaw Pact planners as an attitude indicating that Turkey had become dispensable in the eyes of the West and the United States. Furthermore, the arms embargo led the Western banking and financial system to consider Turkey as a high-risk country. The restrictive policies pursued by these institutions toward Turkey, as a result of this evaluation, exacerbated Turkey's economic and social difficulties and made the ground more propitious for the subversive activities undertaken by international Communism.

The Soviets deny vehemently any suggestion of a threat toward Turkey and talk about "friendship, cooperation, good neighborly behavior and non-interference in domestic affairs" and get angry when any Turkish official makes a reference to the Soviet threat, even hypothetically, as did the statement of the Turkish commander of NATO's Southeast Europe headquarters during a recent NATO manuever in Eastern Turkey. Taking into account the Soviet sensitivities on this question, Turkish authorities refrain from

pointing a finger at any specific Communist state. On the other hand, there are so many evidences of outside involvement in our terrorist problem that everybody knows now what is meant by the term "outside powers" in official Turkish statements.

I should like to mention some of the obvious and undeniable signs of Great Power involvement in Turkish terrorism in a logical sequence:

Let us start with the question of logistics and training of Turkish guerillas. In a recent press conference (on the 6th of June) the Prime Minister disclosed that illegal firearms confiscated by Turkish security forces September 1980 through May 1981 totalled 473,553. Together with 160,170 various types of arms voluntarily delivered by the people, in response to a government decree, the grand total becomes 633,724. General Evren pointed out in his speech in Konya last February that the total value of such a tremendous amount of arms and ammunition runs to 25 billion TL, an equivalent of 250 million dollars. He added that the total amount of money acquired through bank robberies and extortion by the terrorists do not even constitute one fiftieth (2 percent) of the cost of armaments in the hands of terrorists.

"Where does it come from," he asked, "if not from a rich external power?"

The types of arms and equipment are also quite interesting. The breakdown is as follows: pistols--472,114, automatic pistols--3,095, infantry rifles--30,183, automatic rifles--4,361, shotguns for hunting--13,636, and the number of rounds of various ammunition--2,155,036 (the latter figures were provided by a different source and do not necessarily tally with the totals mentioned by the Prime Minister). The number of Kalashnikov automatic rifles has been given as 1,371 as of the 1st of June. There also have been found a large number of Soviet-made anti-tank mines, booby traps, etc. In 1978, the security forces discovered 446 Soviet-made anti-tank rockets hidden in caves near Mardin, a southeastern Turkish town on the Syrian Border.

It is a routine news item in Turkish newspapers that small ships from the Bulgarian Black Sea area are loaded with smuggled arms and ammunition earmarked for Turkey. On June 3rd, 1977, Turkish police intercepted a Greek cargo vessel, "Vasoula," on the Bosphorous coming from Varna, a port of Bulgaria. The vessel was carrying 67 tons of armaments allegedly destined

for Ethiopia (as claimed later at the court trial), contrary to the original information given to Istanbul Port authorities. In 1976, Turkish security authorities captured Argentina-made firearms on some Turkish terrorists. It was learned later that these weapons were originally procured from Argentina by a Bulgarian state agency, shipped via air cargo to Bulgaria, and ended up in the hands of Turkish terrorists in a matter of a few weeks. This incident was reported in the Turkish as well as international press and caused a diplomatic scandal between Turkey and Bulgaria.

According to security authorities, 60 percent of the captured arms and ammunition are Western models with brand names and serial numbers. However, the Turkish authorities found later on, through official demarches in respective countries of origin, that most of them were not manufactured in those countries. A case in point was the question of some French weapons captured on terrorists, such as pistols with French brand, "Unique," which proved to be imitations of the originals. Another example is the Italian "Berettas" captured from the terrorists. When the Turkish government communicated with Italy on this question, it became evident that those captured proved to be manufactured in Bulgaria under a license agreement, as the serial numbers of the same weapons were in the hands of Italian Police stock of arms.

When the Soviet government and other satellite states are approached as a result of such investigations, they deny any complicity and give the standard answer that they cannot control the flow of their manufactured arms, due to a widespread network of arms smuggling in the world. It is indeed true that some of these arms smugglers have established profitable business contacts with some official Bulgarian commercial agencies, as reported by Turkish press and book publishers (Istanbul Daily Jurriyet reported in a serial of such undertakings in November 1980, and also Mr. Ugur Mumcu's book on arms smuggling).

Of the remaining 40 percent, about 30 percent of the captured arms and ammunition carry clear signs of Eastern European origin and the rest (10 percent) are of domestic manufacture. Another route of arms entry into Turkey is via the Syrian border where several crates of newly manufactured Soviet arms

and ammunition were discovered recently, including anti-aircraft automatic guns, anti-tank rockets, etc.

A captured Kurdish Marxist terrorist, interviewed by the Turkish television on the 2nd of March 1981, clearly stated that "they had valuable help of money and ammunition from the socialist countries." He also made no secret that he had had eight months of guerilla training in PLO camps in Lebanon, "like so many others from Turkey." The government sources informed me that Turkish guerillas are generally trained in either Al Saika camps in Syria or G. Habbash's PFLP camps in Lebanon. They are trained in three-month programs and now Turks are second in number only to the Arabs in those camps. At the moment there are about 300 Turks under training. The captured terrorists told the police that their training instructors were from Cuba, East Germany and North Korea. One of them had "advanced electronic bombs courses" with the Armenian terrorists specializing in this field.

The Armenian terrorist organization, "Asala," does not deny its Marxist orientation and admits working in close cooperation with the Turkish terrorists in Palestinian camps as well as abroad. In a statement given to the Middle East Review, and carried by the Turkish daily, Tercuman, of the 20th of June 1981, an Asala leader said "we are fighting for the same cause with the Turkish terrorist." This confirms our diagnosis that Armenian terrorism, which claims responsibility for 60 attacks against Turkish targets, as well as the assassinations of 18 Turkish diplomats, has been part of a larger picture of international terrorism instigated and heavily supported by the countries of Eastern Europe. There is, therefore, no reason to treat it as a separate case, a claim for human rights, etc.

At this point, I should like to point out how vitally important it is to disband or break the ring of sympathizers around the terrorists who give them moral and material support. In order to deal with terrorism effectively, the terrorists ought to be isolated from the ring of outside sympathizers around them. Unfortunately, some countries, including some of the Allies in NATO, do not seem to realize the importance of this point. In Paris and Athens, cooperation among various terrorist groups is protected by responsible

authorities. Hundreds of banners, reading "Greeks, Kurds, Armenians fighting for the same cause" have been carried in open-air meetings in Paris, Athens, etc., as a protest against Turkey.

The complicity in Turkish terrorism of Soviet and Eastern European states is so well documented that the press organs of the Turkish terrorists "Dev-Yol," "Dev Sol," etc., have been full of praise for "The great Socialist homeland Soviet State" and for the support expected from "the great Soviet Union."

The Soviet Union still makes extensive use of the Clandestine Radio Broadcasts of the Turkish Communist Party to increase the morale of imprisoned left-wing terrorists. It has actively supported an armed uprising of Marxist guerillas in Ismir Taris Factory in February of 1980 by these radio broadcasts. On 5 May 1981, they paid tribute to the guerillas killed in armed clashes with the police in the 1970's. The Soviets use the Turkish Communist Party Broadcasting as their alter ego and to convey messages to the Turkish underground Communist cells and guerilla formations.

THE PRESENT SCENE

The Turkish military, in the last 9 months, has managed to deal effectively with rampant terrorism. The death toll dropped to less than one a day. Among the 412 people who died in the last 9 months, nearly 80 percent were terrorists who ventured into armed clashes with the security forces. The number of those arrested was 22,632, convicted 1,601, and detained 3,986 as of the 1st of June this year.

There is intensive propaganda carried out by former terrorists who fled abroad, in close cooperation with the Communist parties and extreme leftist groups in Western Europe. There are allegations of torture and violation of human rights. In fact, there are 154 files on torture allegations. About 70 policemen have been prosecuted on torture allegations. The government acknowledges that there have been a few individual cases in such a big operation. However, the head of the state and the government deny any deliberate policy on this question.

Turkey's head of state, General Evren, claimed in one of his recent statements that the government security forces have been about 90 percent

successful in dealing with terrorism. Yet there is still a lot to be done to eradicate the disease. There are already signs that those who have gone underground (Newsweek Magazine reported that about one-third of the terrorists have been captured, one-third fled abroad and the rest went underground) are far from being utterly demoralized and are waiting for an opportune moment to come to the surface again.

If the outside world is informed about the real nature of terrorism in Turkey, if an international effort is launched to go to the root of the matter with the aim of eradicating alien support for terrorist organizations, Turkey may put her house in order within a reasonably short span of time. Our social system and free institutions will be adequate to meet the challenge of any future adventure on the part of Communist terrorists. As I tried to explain earlier, the right-wing terrorism in Turkey has been a derivative phenomenon. This is confirmed by recent events. While the security authorities have been very successful in dealing with Communist terrorists, right-wing terrorism has vanished from the scene completely. I feel confident and optimistic that with better understanding of the roots of the matter, with moral and material support to our nation from her friends abroad and with effective measures of dissuasion against outside supporters of terrorism, peace, stability and democratic rule can be restored in Turkey sooner than expected.